

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 4, 7 and 8 have been amended.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dillon et al. (U.S. patent number 4,016,597). Amended claim 4 recites in part:

“outputting character information to a monitor including a screen, wherein the character information is indicative of which of the filters is positioned in front of the image pick-up element in the step of selectively positioning; and displaying the character information, together with the image or another image shot by the camera, on the screen.”

Dillon fails to teach or suggest the noted limitations. Accordingly, claim 4 is allowable over Dillon. The Examiner cited the combination of Dillon and Fukushima (U.S. patent number 5,903,700) in rejecting claim 6 as obvious. Fukushima also fails to teach or suggest the noted limitations. Fukushima teaches a recording/reproducing apparatus 12 for connecting to a color camera or a black-and-white camera (10:34-40). In order to discriminate between a color camera and a black-and-white camera, the design of an icon *indicating a camera* on a display 100 may be changed (10:41-43). In the case of a color camera, a colored icon may be displayed, and in the case of a black-and-white camera, a black-and-white icon may be displayed (10:43-46). Fukushima’s teaching of an icon for indicating a color or black-and-white *camera* does not teach or suggest character information that is *indicative of which of the filters is positioned in front of the image pick-up element in the step of selectively positioning*, as required by claim 4. Displaying an icon for indicating a connected camera does not teach or suggest information that is indicative of which filter is selectively positioned. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable over a combination of Dillon and Fukushima.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dillon. Claim 5 depends from claim 4. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4, claim 5 is

allowable over Dillon and a combination of Dillon and Fukushima.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dillon. Claim 8 recites in part:

“an image signal transmission interface for outputting character information to a monitor for display thereon together with the image or another image shot by the camera, wherein the character information is indicative of which of the filters is positioned in front of the image pick-up element by the optical filter switching mechanism.”

Dillon fails to teach or suggest the noted limitations. Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable over Dillon. Fukushima also fails to teach or suggest the noted limitations. As discussed above with respect to claim 4, Fukushima teaches an icon for indicating a color or black-and-white *camera*. This does not teach or suggest character information that is indicative of which filter is positioned in front of an image pick-up element by an optical filter switching mechanism, as required by claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 is allowable over a combination of Dillon and Fukushima.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dillon. Claim 2 depends from claim 8. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 8, claim 2 is allowable over Dillon and a combination of Dillon and Fukushima.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dillon. Claim 3 depends from claim 8. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 8, claim 3 is allowable over Dillon and a combination of Dillon and Fukushima.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillon in view of Fukushima. Claim 6 has been canceled.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillon in view of Fukushima. Claim 7 depends from claim 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5, claim 7 is allowable over Dillon in view of Fukushima.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a

Appl. No. : 09/830,769

Amdt. Dated : September 6, 2006

Reply to Office action of : May 26, 2006

telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33555.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: Brad C Spencer  
Brad C. Spencer, Reg. No. 57076

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: September 6, 2006